UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,071	07/30/2003	Terry M. Martin	200208611-1	9436

22879 7590 02/08/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
IBRAHIM, MOHAMED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/08/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/630,071	MARTIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohamed Ibrahim	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,8,9,11,13,15-17,19,21-25,28,32 and 36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, 32 and 36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/25/2007 has been entered.

Claims 5-7, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20, 26-27, 29-31 and 33-35 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 13, 21, and 36 have been amended.

Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, 32 and 36 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-17, 19, 21-25, 28, 32 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karakashian et al. (Karakashian), U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0064503 A1 in view of Kaler et al. (Kaler), 2004/0199586 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Karakashian discloses a method for collecting data regarding a messaging session (see e.g. Fig. 1, Fig. 3, and paragraph [0033], intercepting message session), the method comprising:

intercepting an incoming message sent to a first network service (see e.g. paragraph [0032]); writing session information relevant to the incoming message to a thread-local variable (see e.g. paragraphs [0033] and [0038]; The web service invoke requests is saved in the container driver); and providing the incoming message to the first network service (see e.g. paragraph [0081]); sending an outgoing message from the network service to a second network service or a client (see e.g. the disclosure of claim 1 wherein the message context is modified and sent the web services destination); intercepting the outgoing message sent by the first network service (see e.g. fig. 3 and paragraph [0040]; interceptors for both inbound and outbound messages); performing a thread-local variable lookup so as to retrieve the session information written to the thread-local variable (see e.g. paragraph [0038] and [0107]); instrumenting the outgoing message with the session information (see e.g. paragraphs [0026], [0033] and [0047]); and providing the instrumented outgoing message to the second network service or client (see e.g. paragraph [0081] and claim 1; passing the instrumented message to the web service destination).

Although Karakashian discloses the invention substantially as claimed, it does not explicitly discloses session information including a session identification, a source name, of the sender of the message, a message type, a destination name of the intended recipient, and a message received time.

Kaler teaches system for using expressive session information in a distributed system where the session information include session identification, message type, session name, sending and receiving nodes etc. (see figs. 3-4, paragraphs [0006], [0016]-[0017], [0019] and [0041]). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kaler with that of Karakashian. Motivation for dong so would have to unambiguously identify each individual session from plurality of sessions.

Regarding claim 2, Karakashian-Kaler teaches wherein intercepting an incoming message comprises intercepting an extensible markup language (XML) message wrapped in a simple object access protocol (SOAP) envelope (see e.g. Fig. 1 and paragraph [0041]).

Regarding claim 3, Karakashian-Kaler teaches wherein intercepting an incoming message comprises intercepting a service request (see e.g. paragraph [0034]).

Regarding claim 4, Karakashian-Kaler teaches wherein intercepting an incoming message comprises intercepting a service response (see e.g. paragraph [0034]).

Regarding claim 8, Karakashian-Kaler teaches wherein writing session information to a thread-local variable comprises writing session information to a thread- local variable using a simple object access protocol (SOAP) message handler (see e.g. paragraph

[0038] and [0146]-[0147]).

Regarding claim 9, Karakashian-Kaler teaches further comprising storing session data regarding the incoming message in a database (see e.g. paragraph [0038]).

Regarding claim 11, Karakashian-Kaler teaches further comprising storing session data regarding the outgoing message to a database (see e.g. paragraph [0038]).

Claim 13 list all the same sub-elements of claim 1, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 13. The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 13.

Regarding claim 15-16, the limitations of these claims have already been addressed (see claim 8).

Regarding claim17, the limitation of this claim has already been addressed (see claim 9 above).

Regarding claim 19, the limitation of this claim has already been addressed (see e.g. claim 11 above).

Claim 21 list all the same sub-elements of claim 1, but in computer readable medium form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 21. The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 21.

Regarding claim 22, the limitation of this claim has already been addressed (see claim 5 above).

Regarding claim 23-24, the limitations of these claims have already been addressed (see claim 8 above).

Regarding claim 25, the limitations of this claim have already been addressed (see claims 9 and 11, above).

Claim 28 list all the same elements of claim 1, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 28.

Regarding claim 32, Karakashian-Kaler teaches a physical computer-readable medium that stores a message handler (see e.g. paragraph [0151]) comprising:

logic configured to intercept an outgoing message directed at a system network service (see e.g. paragraph [0032]);

logic configured to store information at least concerning the send time of the outgoing message in a database logic configured to perform a thread-local variable lookup to receive session information pertinent to the outgoing message (see e.g. paragraph [0038]); logic configured to instrument the outgoing message with session information (see e.g. paragraphs [0026], [0033] and [0047]); and logic configured to forward the outgoing message from the network service (see e.g. paragraph [0081] and claim 1; passing the instrumented message to the web service destination).

Claim 36 list all the same elements of claim 32, but in apparatus form rather than computer readable medium form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 32 applies equally as well to claim 36. The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 36.

Prior Art of Record

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form PTO-892 (Notice of Reference Cited) for a list of relevant prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohamed Ibrahim whose telephone number is 571-270-1132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MI/

WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100